Multifractality: generic property of eigenstates of 2D disordered metals

Vladimir I. Fal'ko [1,3] and K.B. Efetov[2,4]
[1] *Max-Planck-Institut für Feskörperforschung Heisenbergstr. 1, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany*
[2] *Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Komplexe Systeme, Heisenbergstr. 1, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany*
[3] *Institute of Solid State Physics RAS, Chernogolovka, 142432 Russia*
[4] *Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Moscow, Russia*
(February 1, 2008)

arXiv:cond-mat/9503096v1 17 Mar 1995

The distribution function of local amplitudes of eigenstates of a two-dimensional disordered metal is calculated. Although the distribution of comparatively small amplitudes is governed by laws similar to those known from the random matrix theory, its decay at larger amplitudes is non-universal and much slower. This leads to the multifractal behavior of inverse participation numbers at any disorder. From the formal point of view, the multifractality originates from non-trivial saddle-point solutions of supersymmetric σ-model used in calculations.

Fractality of some unusual objects of condensed matter physics has been intensively discussed during the last decade [1]. This notion has also penetrated to the theory of disordered systems for characterizing the vicinity of the localization transitions. For example, using the coefficients of the inverse participation numbers (IPN) known from the renormalization group treatment in $2+\epsilon$ dimensions [2] Castellani and Peliti [3] have suggested the multifractal structure of wave functions at the localization threshold. Later, due to considerable efforts in numerical simulations, it has been recognized that, at criticality, the wave functions are really multifractal which gives rise to a spectrum of critical exponents [4].

The concept of multifractality of wave functions has been introduced [3,4] as a way to characterize their complexity in the pre-localized regime and originates from the numerically observed non-trivial dependencies of the inverse participation numbers $t_n(V)$ on the volume V of a system. By definition, the latter are the moments of the distribution function $f(t)$ of local amplitudes $t \equiv |\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$ of wave functions at an arbitrary point $\mathbf{r}$ inside a sample,

$$t_n = \int_0^\infty t^n f(t) dt, \tag{1}$$

$$f(t) = (V\nu)^{-1} \left\langle \sum_\alpha \delta(t - |\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})|^2) \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_\alpha) \right\rangle$$

where $\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ and ϵ_α are eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of state α of a confined system. The symbol $\langle\rangle$ stands for averaging over disorder; ν is the average density of states. The distribution function and the wave functions are properly normalized such that $t_0 = 1$ and $t_1 \equiv V^{-1}$.

The inverse participation numbers indicate very sensitively the degree of disorder-induced-localization of states through their dependence $t_n(V)$ on the volume of the system. In a pure metal or a ballistic chaotic box where the wave functions extend over the whole system one has

$$t_n \propto 1/V^n. \tag{2}$$

If disorder makes the localization length L_c much shorter than the sample size $L \sim V^{1/d}$, the coefficients t_n are insensitive to L. However, a very interesting information about the development of localization comes from the analysis of $t_n(V)$ for small samples with $L < L_c$.

The latter situation can occur in the vicinity of a localization-delocalization transition, when the length $L_c(\epsilon)$ can be larger than L. In this critical regime, the multifractality is a manifestation of pre-localization in a piece of a matter which still dominantly shows the metallic properties. In the language of the coefficients t_n, this is described as

$$V t_n(\epsilon) \propto L^{-\tau(n)}, \qquad \tau(n) = (n-1) d^*(n), \tag{3}$$

where $d^*(n)$ differs from the physical dimension d of the system and is a function of n. This function gives the values of the fractal dimensions $d^*(n)$ for each n. For ballistic waves in a billiard, one would have $d^*(n) \equiv d$. Once we assume that the envelope of a typical wave function at the length scale shorter than L_c obeys a power law $\psi(r) \propto r^{-\mu}$ with a single fixed exponent $\mu < d/2$ [6,3], the set of IPN's shows $d^* = d - 2\mu$ different from d but the same for all $n > d/(2\mu)$. This is when one speaks [6] of a fractal behavior with the fractal dimension d^*.

If $d^*(n)$ is not a constant, this signals about some more sophisticated structure of wave functions. They can be imagined as splashes of multiply interfering waves at different scales and with various amplitudes, and possibly, with a self-similarity characterized by a relation between the amplitude of a local splash of a wave function, t, and the exponent $\mu(t)$ of the envelope of its extended power-law tail. The spatial structure of wave functions in the vicinity of the localization transition was a subject of extensive numerical studies [5,4,6]. To distinguish between the fractal and multifractal behavior in numerics, one has to detect and compare the values $d^*(n)$ coming from, at least, several lowest IPN's. In the pioneering works [5], the assertion about the fractality at criticality has been made on the basis of studies of $d^*(2)$, and a

non-trivial dependence of dimensionality $d^*(2)$ on disorder in 2D metals [6] has been observed. Later on, numerical study of single-electron states at the transition between the plateaus in the regime of the Quantum Hall Effect (QHE) [4] has established different fractal $d^*(n)$ for different IPN's, which supported the idea about the multifractality in the critical regime.

The goal of this Letter is to demonstrate that the multifractality of wave functions is a *generic property of 2D disordered systems* as soon as the sample size L does not exceed the formal localization length L_c. In some sense, the two-dimensional system is critical not only in the QHE regime, and we consider the limit of relatively weak magnetic fields. If disorder is weak (the diffusion coefficient D is large, so that $2\pi\nu D \gg 1$), the localization length L_c is exponentially large and, therefore, the system is an ideal object to observe the multifractality at a large scale. To anticipate a little, our calculation gives

$$d^*(n) = 2 - n\left(4\pi^2\nu D\right)^{-1} \tag{4}$$

which can be associated with a power-law tail of the envelope with the exponent $\mu(t) < 1$. The result of Eq. (4) is essentially non-perturbative and cannot be obtained by any expansion in diffusion modes usual for describing weak localization effects.

To get this result, we use below the supersymmetry technique [7]. Analytical study of wave functions with this method has started recently [8]. It was discovered that the distribution of local amplitudes of waves in a very small - zero-dimensional (0D) - disordered conductor or a chaotic cavity obeyed the same laws as those predicted in the random matrix theories [9]. One of the achievements of the method is that it makes possible to calculate the distribution function of local amplitudes $f(t)$ as a whole [10], rather than to reconstruct [8] it from the full set of IPN's. This proves to be very helpful for calculations beyond 0D.

Using the supersymmetry technique, one reduces the calculation of the distribution function $f(t)$ to evaluation of a functional integral with the free energy functional

$$F[Q] = \tfrac{\pi\nu}{8}\int \mathrm{Str}\left[D(\nabla Q(\mathbf{r}))^2 - 2\gamma\Lambda Q(\mathbf{r})\right] d\mathbf{r}, \tag{5}$$

where D is the diffusion coefficient, γ is a level width,. The notations for the supermatrices Q and Λ, and for the supertrace 'Str' are the same as in Ref. [7]. A general form of the functional integral valid for an arbitrary magnetic field can be found in Ref. [10]. In what follows, we calculate the distribution function $f(t)$ for the unitary ensemble, although the results for the orthogonal and symplectic ensembles are similar [11]. The unitary ensemble is technically most simple. At the same time, it can be a quite interesting one, due to its relation [12] to the recently suggested description of some strongly correlated systems, such as high T_c materials or $2D$ electron gases at even-denominator filling factors, in terms of fluctuating guage fields [13,14].

For the unitary ensemble, the function $f(t)$ can be equivalently rewritten in a somewhat simpler form

$$f(t) = \lim_{\gamma\to 0}\int \mathrm{D}Q \int \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{4V}\mathrm{Str}(\pi_b^{(1)}Q(\mathbf{r}))$$
$$\times\delta\left(t - \tfrac{\pi\nu\gamma}{2}\mathrm{Str}(\pi_b^{(2)}Q(\mathbf{r}_o)\right)\exp\left(-F[Q]\right) \tag{6}$$

where the $\pi_b^{(1,2)}$ select from Q its boson-boson sector,

$$\pi_b^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix}\pi_b & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix},\ \pi_b^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & \pi_b\end{pmatrix},\ \pi_b = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & \tau_0\end{pmatrix},$$

and $\tau_{0,3}$ are the Pauli matrices. The limit $\gamma \to 0$ in Eq. (6) corresponds to a closed system with elastic scattering only, and one could, first, calculate the integral over $Q(\mathbf{r})$ and take the limit $\gamma \to 0$ at the end. However, it is better to get rid of the parameter γ at an earlier stage by integrating, first, over the zero space harmonics of Q.

If we restrict ourselves with the integration over this harmonics only, we arrive at the $0D$ result of Ref. [10]. Nevertheless, this would not be enough for probing the states which are the precursors of localization, since the latter is related to the non-homogeneous fluctuations $Q(\mathbf{r})$ [7]. Moreover, as has been recently shown by Muzykantskii and Khmelnitskii [15], the treatement of rare localization events in the metallic regime (such as long-living states in an open mesoscopic conductor) can be advanced using the saddle-point solutions of the supersymmetric field theory. Thus, we also account for spatial variations of Q non-perturbatively, using the saddle-point method like in Ref. [15], so that the integration over the zero harmonics is only our first step.

To realize this plan, we represent the matrix Q as

$$Q(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r})\Lambda\bar{V}(\mathbf{r}), \quad V(\mathbf{r})\bar{V}(\mathbf{r}) = 1,$$

and substitute $V(\mathbf{r}) \to V(\mathbf{r}_o)V(\mathbf{r})$ and $Q(\mathbf{r}) \to V(\mathbf{r}_o)Q(\mathbf{r}_o)\bar{V}(\mathbf{r}_o)$. In terms of new variables $V(\mathbf{r})$ and $Q(\mathbf{r})$, the first (gradient) term in Eq. (5) preserves its form, but now the condition $Q(\mathbf{r}_o) = \Lambda$ has to be fulfilled. The second term in Eq. (5) transforms into

$$F_2 = -\frac{\pi\nu}{4}\int d\mathbf{r}\mathrm{Str}(\tilde{Q}_o Q(\mathbf{r})), \quad \tilde{Q}_o = \bar{V}(\mathbf{r}_o)\Lambda V(\mathbf{r}_o).$$

A corresponding substitution can be done in the pre-exponential of Eq. (6), too. This enables us to integrate over Q_o. The limit $\gamma \to 0$ drastically simplifies the computation, since it makes the essential values of the variable θ_{1o} parametrizing the non-compact sector of the supermatrix Q_o as large as $\cosh\theta_{1o} \sim 1/\gamma$. Performing a standard integration over the elements of the supermatrix Q_o - the procedure being a slight modification of the calculations of Ref. [10] - we reduce Eqs. (5, 6) to the form

$$f(t) = \tfrac{1}{V}\tfrac{d^2}{dt^2}\left\{\int_{Q(\mathbf{r}_o)=\Lambda}\exp\left(-\tilde{F}[t,Q]\right)\mathrm{D}Q(\mathbf{r})\right\} \tag{7}$$

where the free energy functional $\tilde{F}[t,Q]$ is determined by

$$\tilde{F}[t,Q]=\int d\mathbf{r}\mathrm{Str}\left(\tfrac{\pi\nu D}{8}(\nabla Q(\mathbf{r}))^2-\tfrac{t}{4}\Lambda\Pi Q(\mathbf{r})\right). \quad (8)$$

The matrix Π selects from Q its non-compact boson-boson sector $Q_b=V_b\Lambda\bar{V}_b$:

$$\Pi=\begin{pmatrix}\pi_b & \pi_b\\ \pi_b & \pi_b\end{pmatrix},\ V_b=\exp\begin{pmatrix}0 & u\pi_b\theta_1/2\\ u^{+}\pi_b\theta_1/2 & 0\end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

and $u=\exp(i\chi\tau_3)$, where $\theta_1\geq 0$ and $0\leq\chi<2\pi$. The 0D result can be obtained just by putting $Q(\mathbf{r})=\Lambda$ for all $\mathbf{r}$, and one ends with the Porter-Thomas distribution $f^{(0)}(t)=V\exp(-Vt)$ for the unitary ensemble which gives the IPN which obey Eq. (2) and show neither multifractal nor fractal behavior.

Nonetheless, this would be only an approximate procedure, because the value $Q(\mathbf{r})\equiv\Lambda$ does not correspond to the minimum of the functional $\tilde{F}[t,Q]$ when $t\neq 0$. The second term acts on the matrix Q as if an external field tended to "align" the matrix Q_b along such a direction that $\theta_1\to\infty$. However, the condition $Q(\mathbf{r}_o)=\Lambda$ prevents from that, and, as in Ref. [15], the minimum corresponds to a non-homogeneous configuration of a finite $Q_b(\mathbf{r})$.

The solution θ_t corresponding to the minimum of the functional $F[t,Q]$ can be found after substituting Eqs. (9) into (8) and varying θ_1 under the condition $\mathbf{n}\nabla\theta_t=0$ at the boundary of a sample, and $\theta_t(\mathbf{r}_o)=0$ in the origin. As a result, we obtain

$$\Delta\theta_t(\mathbf{r})=-\tfrac{t}{\pi\nu D}\exp(-\theta_t(\mathbf{r})),\ \chi(\mathbf{r})=\pi, \quad (10)$$

where Δ is the Laplacian. This saddle-point equation is somewhat different to that discussed in Ref. [15]. The solution of Eq. (10) has to be substituted into the free energy functional $\tilde{F}[t,Q]$ which takes the form

$$F_t=\int\left(\tfrac{\pi\nu D}{2}(\nabla\theta_t)^2+t\exp(-\theta_t)\right)d\mathbf{r} \quad (11)$$

and gives the final result with an exponential accuracy.

In principle, it can be important to take into account fluctuations in the vicinity of the extremum. In the lowest order, these fluctuations contribute to the pre-exponential. As concerns higher order terms, one should estimate them to be sure about the corrections to the approximations we made. This can be done in an invariant form representing $Q(\mathbf{r})$ as

$$Q(\mathbf{r})=V_t(\mathbf{r})\Lambda\tfrac{(1+iP(\mathbf{r}))}{(1-iP(\mathbf{r}))}\bar{V}_t(\mathbf{r}),\ P\equiv\begin{pmatrix}0 & B\\ \bar{B} & 0\end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

The supermatrix $V_t(\mathbf{r})$ is determined by Eq. (9) with the optimal solution θ_t substituted as the variable θ_1, and P is treated as a fluctuation around the inhomogeneous optimal solution. To evaluate the contribution of fluctuations P, one has to substitute $Q(\mathbf{r})$ from Eq. (12) into Eqs. (7, 8) and, then, expand them in P. In the zeroth order in P, Eq. (12) corresponds to the optimal solution which defines F_t, Eq. (11). After expanding the action $\tilde{F}[t,Q]$ in series on the perturbation P, one can check that the above choice of $\bar{V}_t$ cancels the linear terms $F^{(1)}$, and $\tilde{F}[t,Q]=F_t+F^{(2)}+F^{(3)}+F^{(4)}+....$ At this stage of calculating the integral in Eq. (7), one has to keep both F_t and $F^{(2)}$ in the exponent $e^{-\tilde{F}[t,Q]}$, but expand it with respect to other higher order terms on P. Then each term of this expansion is given by a Gaussian integral and can be evaluated using Wick's theorem.

Estimating the contribution of the higher-order terms, one can see that they are not important as long as the sample size $L\sim V^{1/d}$ is smaller than the localization length L_c which holds in 1D and 2D samples. As concerns the 3D case, the fluctuations are always small when disorder is weak. In all the cases, the contribution from F_t dominates, but we are also aware of what comes from square terms $F^{(2)}$. Calculating Gaussian integrals one obtains for the pre-exponential J

$$J=\exp\left\{\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_n\ln\left(\chi_f^4(n)/\prod_{\alpha,\beta}\chi_b(\alpha,\beta,n)\right)\right\}. \quad (13)$$

J differs from unity, since the optimal fluctuation breaks the symmetry between anti- (f) and commuting (b) components of P and splits the spectra $\{\chi_f(n)\}$ and $\{\chi_b(\alpha,\beta,n)\}$ of their eigen-modes. The set of four-fold degenerate modes χ_f and non-degenerate χ_b are defined from the 'Schroedinger equations' $[-2\pi\nu D\Delta+U-\chi]s=0$, where the effective potentials $U_{(f,b)\alpha}=2\pi\nu Dk_{(f,b)\alpha}(\nabla\theta_t)^2+t\kappa_{(f,b),\alpha}\exp(-\theta_t)$ (k and κ are real numbers [11]) obey the sum rule $\sum U_{b,\alpha}=4U_{f,\alpha}$.

Until now all the manipulations did not depend on the dimensionality. However, solving Eq. (10) has to be done for each dimensionality separately. Results for 1D and 3D will be presented elsewhere [11]. Below, we discuss the 2D case. The use of the σ-model limits the length-scales from below by the value of the mean free path l. Therefore, when solving Eq. (10), we cut off the radii $r<l$ and replace the conditions $Q=\Lambda$ ($\theta_t=0$) at the origin by the same requirement at $r=r_0\sim l$, provided the dependence of the finally derived optimal action F_t on the cut-off length is weak. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the sample in the form of a disk of a radius L, $\ln(L/l)\ll(2\pi\nu D)^2$, and place the observation point $\mathbf{r}_o$ in its center. This geometry allows us to seek for an axially symmetric solution of Eq. (10) which, with the parameter $\rho=\sqrt{2\pi\nu D/tl^2}$, takes the exact form

$$e^{-\theta_t}=\left[\frac{2(l/r)^{1-A}[\sqrt{(\frac{1}{A\rho})^2+1}+1]}{[\sqrt{(\frac{1}{A\rho})^2+1}+1]^2-(\frac{1}{A\rho})^2(\frac{r}{l})^{2A}}\right]^2\sim\left(\frac{l}{r}\right)^{2\mu}$$

where $A=1-\mu$ is determined from the boundary conditions as

$$\sqrt{A^2+\rho^{-2}}+A=\tfrac{(L/l)^A}{\rho}\sqrt{\tfrac{1+A}{1-A}}. \quad (14)$$

Eq. (14) has positive roots if $\rho>\ln\frac{L}{l}\gg 1$, which limits the amplitude t by the value $(\lambda_F l)^{-1}$, the density of a

plane wave forward-and-backward scattered within the mean free path length. In this limit $\mu \ll 1$, which is the reason for the power-law asymptotics of the optimal $\exp(-\theta_t)$. The same conditions also simplify the search of roots of Eq. (14) and reduce it to the equation on μ:

$$\mu = \frac{z(T)}{2\ln(L/l)};\ ze^z = T \equiv \frac{tV\ln(L/l)}{2\pi^2\nu D}. \qquad (15)$$

The leaading terms of the optimal free energy F_t can be found as

$$F_t \approx (2\pi)^2\nu D\{\mu + \mu^2 \ln\frac{L}{l}\},$$

and the logarithmic dependence of F_t on the ratio L/l in all the cases justifies the cut-off procedure and makes meaningful the use of the derived formulae for an arbitrary position of the observation point and the shape of the sample.

One can also evaluate the pre-factor J from Eq. (13) and find that $J = 1 + 0(T^2\ )$ at $T \ll 1$, and $J \propto \mu\exp(\mu\ln\frac{L}{l}) \sim T\ln T$ when $T \gg 1$. This confirms our previous statement that the optimal action dominates over other contributions and enables us to find the form of the distribution function $f^{(2)}(t)$ for small, $t \equiv |\psi|^2 <$, and for large, $t > 2\pi^2\nu D/(V\ln\frac{L}{l})$, amplitudes with the exponential accuracy:

$$f^{(2)} \approx V\begin{cases} \exp\left(-Vt[1-T/2]\right), & T \ll 1 \\ \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2\nu D}{\ln(L/l)}\ln^2 T\right), & T \gg 1. \end{cases} \qquad (16)$$

From this expression, one can conclude that disorder makes the appearence of high-amplitude splashes of wave functions much more probable than one would expect from the 0D Porter-Thomas formula. Obviously, this is a localization effect. But the tails of the states do not decay exponentially, as one would expect for a particle localized in a quantum well or in a 1D wire beyond the localization length: Even in the asymptotic regime, the size L of the system influences the distribution. The splashes look as if they were formed by focusing the waves by those rare configurations of scatterers which play the role of 'parabolic' mirrors. The structure of these states can be anticipated from the way how their distribution function feel the boundary. Since this comes in through the form of the optimal fluctuation, we believe that they have the power-decaying tails, $|\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2 \sim e^{-\theta_t(r)} \approx (l/r)^{2\mu}$ ($\mu < 1$), which approach the limiting r^{-2} dependence for the highest amplitudes $t \sim (l\lambda_F)^{-1}$.

Moreover, the form of IPN's, t_n derived on the basis of Eq. (16) shows a scaling with the size of a system which forces us to assign them a multifractal nature. To find the moments t_n accurately enough, we have to take into account that, despite of that the cross-over to the 0d case looks like a formal limit $T(t) \to 0$, the Porter-Thomas statistics fails unless the condition $tV \ll \sqrt{2\pi\nu D}$ is satisfied. Hence, only the first few ratios t_n, $2 \le n \ll \sqrt{2\pi\nu D}$, can be estimated by using a finite polynomial expansion of $f(t)$ into the series on T. The result would look as a correction to the values expected for chaotic quantum billiards [16]. Alternatively, we derive the higher order IPN's from the intermediate result of Eq. (7),

$$t_n = \frac{n(n-1)}{V^n}\int dtJ(t)\exp\left\{-F_t + (n-2)\ln(tV)\right\},$$

by the saddle-point method. The moments t_n calculated in both ways are in a good agreement with each other and, in the leading order, take the form

$$t_n \approx \frac{\min\{n!, [2\pi\nu D/\ln\frac{L}{l}]^n\}}{l^{2\delta}}\left(\frac{1}{V}\right)^{n-\delta}, \quad \delta \approx \frac{n(n-1)}{8\pi^2\nu D}.$$

To summarize the result of the derived above exact statistics of amplitudes of wave functions in mesoscopic disordered conductors, we end with such a volume-dependence of the inverse participation numbers t_n which manifests the multifractal behavior of quantum states, Eq. (3). Multifractality seems to be the generic property of 2D disordered systems. In the unitary ensemble, the multifractal dimensions are $d^* = 2 - n(4\pi^2\nu D)^{-1}$, and all over the metallic regime, the dependence of d^* on n and the level of disorder, Eq. (4), is exact and can be a subject of numerical verifications.

We thank D. Khmelnitskii for sending us the preprint [15] prior to publication.

[1] B.B. Mandelbrot: The fractal Geometry of Nature, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco (1983); R. Benzi *et al*, J. Phys. A**17**, 3521 (1984); J. Phys. A **18**, 2157 (1985); T.C. Halsey, *et al* Phys. Rev.A **33,** (1986)
[2] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B**36**, 209 (1980)
[3] C. Castellani, L. Peliti, J. Phys. A **19,** L429 (1986)
[4] M. Janssen, O. Viehweger, U. Fastenrath and J. Hajdu, Introduction to the Theory of the Integer Quantum Hall Effect, VCH, Weinheim (1994), and Refs. therein
[5] H.Aoki, J.Phys.C**16,** L205 (1983); Phys. Rev.B**33,** 7310 (1985); B. Kramer *et al*, Surf. Sci. **196,** 127 (1988)
[6] M. Schreiber, J. Phys. C **18,** 2493, (1985)
[7] K.B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983)
[8] K.B. Efetov, V.N.Prigodin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1315 (1993)
[9] T.A. Brody *et al*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 385 (1981)
[10] V.I. Fal'ko, K.B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 11267 (1994)
[11] V.I. Fal'ko and K.B. Efetov, unpublished
[12] A.G. Aronov, A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16609 (1994)
[13] P.W. Anderson, Science **235**, 1196 (1987)
[14] B.I. Halperin, P.A. Lee and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993)
[15] B.A. Muzykantskii and D.E. Khmelnitskii, preprint
[16] Y.V. Fyodorov and A.D. Mirlin, unpublished